

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Willie Lewis Johnson, #166593,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 6:06-3483-TLW-WMC
	)	
Medical Department, <u>et. al</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Willie Lewis Johnson (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC.

The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on April 3, 2009. (Doc. #35). The plaintiff then filed a motion to appoint counsel and for an extension of time to “study” his case and “file more motions” on May 11, 2009. (Doc. #38). The Magistrate Judge issued an Order that same day denying the motion for appointment of counsel but granting the plaintiff an extension of time through June 11, 2009 to file a response to the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. When no response was filed by June 11, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a second Order noting that the plaintiff would have until July 10, 2009 to file a response to the defendants’ motion for summary judgment and that the plaintiff’s case would be subject to dismissal if he failed to respond by that date. (Doc. #44). To this date, the plaintiff has filed no response to the defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the

Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #48). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution. (Doc. #48). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on August 7, 2009.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #48). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this action is, hereby, **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

October 2, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina